



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,567	02/27/2002	Yanchun Zhao	CA920010020US1	7960
45541 7590 10/19/2007 HOFFMAN WARNICK & DALESSANDRO LLC 75 STATE ST 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207			EXAMINER PATEL, NIRAV B	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/084,567

Applicant(s)

ZHAO ET AL.

Examiner

Nirav Patel

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007 (Amendment).
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22, 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Aug. 01, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22, 24 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 13 and 24 are amended by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandow et al (US Patent No. 6,938,041) in view of Reshef et al (US Patent No. 6,584,569) and in view of Wagner (US Patent No. 6,085,224).

As per claim 1, Brandow teaches:

said message that including the information entered for constructing a query to access data of the server that includes information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein [Fig. 2, 6A, 6B, 7B-10A].

Reshef teaches:

analyzing the messages that flow between a client browser and a server hosting the web application, intercepting said message before any content of said message is processed by said server [Fig. 2A, 2C, col. 5 lines 1-4]. Further, Reshef teaches:

examining said message to determine if it contains one or more unauthorized elements [Fig. 2A, 2C, col. 7 lines 18-67, col. 8 lines 1-12, col. 9 lines 32-51], the examining comprising: receiving an identification of an execution program set to be used to process said message received [col. 9 lines 60-67, col. 10 table 1]; retrieving an identification of all message types associated with said execution program set; examining said message received by said server in relation to said message types associated with said execution program set [col. 10 table 1, lines 26-61].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Reshef with Brandow, since one would have been motivated to detect vulnerabilities or security flaws in a web application [Reshef, col. 2 lines 18-20].

Wagner teaches:

determining if said message received by said server contains an unauthorized element in relation to the corresponding message type for said message received; if it is determined that said message contains an unauthorized element preventing said message received from being processed by said server; if it is determined that said message does not contain an unauthorized element allowing said message received to be processed by said server [Fig. 1, col. 7 lines 44, col. 15 lines 42-67, col. 16 lines 1-42].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Wagner with Brandow and Reshef, since one would have been motivated to restrict access to resources or data on a computer system

Art Unit: 2135

when the computer is in communication with another computer [Wagner, col. 4 lines 7-9].

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches if it is determined that said message received contains an unauthorized element, preventing said message received from being processed by said server, and causing an error notification to be sent to said user [col. 4 lines 62-67, col. 16 lines 34-47].

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 5, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Wagner teaches:

Art Unit: 2135

if it is determined that said message received does not contain an unauthorized element, allowing said message received to be processed by said serve [Fig. 1, 5, 6].

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches the message comprising a name value pair [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Wagner teaches said element comprises one or more of the following items: an instruction, a command, a character, a parameter, a token, or a string of any of said previous items [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated and further Wagner teaches: said element is interpretable as an instruction or command by said server [col. 15 lines 51-62, Fig. 3].

As per claim 13, it is an apparatus claim corresponds to a method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated and Reshef teaches: network server comprises an Internet network server and said message is received over the Internet by said server from a user [Fig. 2C].

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

As per claims 18 and 19, the rejection of claims 13 and 18 are incorporated and are rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 10 and 11 above.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 12 above.

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Reshef teaches:

the message types are chosen from the group consisting of: single token; *string*; multiple tokens without keywords: OR, UNION and SEMI-COLON; multiple tokens without keywords: UNION and SEMI-COLON; multiple tokens without keywords: SEMI-COLON; and multiple tokens without restriction [col. 9 lines 40-45, col. 10 table 1].

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 21 above.

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Brandow teaches the query is a database query that includes an entirety of the information entered by the user into a field of the web page [Fig. 2, 6A, 6B, 7B-10A].

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 13 and 24, which necessitated new ground of rejection. See rejection above.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

Art Unit: 2135

273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

NBP
10/13/07


KIM V. KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100